United States District Court Southern District of Texas

## **ENTERED**

January 20, 2017 David J. Bradley, Clerk

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

JASON MARC NORTON,	§
(TDCJ-CID #1134361)	§
Petitioner,	§
	§
VS.	§ CIVIL ACTION H-17-0140
	§
STATE OF TEXAS,	§
	§
Respondent.	§

#### **MEMORANDUM AND OPINION**

Jason Marc Norton, an inmate of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Correctional Institutions division, sued in January 2017, seeking a writ of mandamus against the State of Texas. Norton seeks an order compelling the respondent to provide him with the transcripts of the criminal proceedings.

The threshold issue is whether this court has jurisdiction to consider Norton's petition for a writ of mandamus. Based on the pleadings, the record, and the applicable authorities, this court dismisses this petition for lack of jurisdiction. The reasons for this ruling are stated below.

#### I. Procedural History and Background

On November 9, 2014, Norton was charged with delivery of a controlled substance to a child and sexual assault in Cause Number 39156. Norton seeks to compel the State of Texas to provide him with the transcripts of the criminal proceedings so that he can prepare his post-conviction application for state habeas corpus relief.

## II. Analysis

To the extent Norton seeks a writ of mandamus against the State of Texas, this court lacks

jurisdiction. Federal district courts are courts of limited statutory jurisdiction. See

Dunn-McCampbell Royalty Interest, Inc. v. Nat'l Park Serv., 112 F.3d 1283, 1286 (5th Cir. 1997);

Veldhoen v. U.S. Coast Guard, 35 F.3d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1994). The only federal statute conferring

the authority to issue writs of mandamus on the federal district courts is 28 U.S.C. Section 1361.

That statute specifically provides that "[t]he district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any

action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any

agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff." Dunn-McCampbell Royalty Interest, Inc.,

112 F.3d at 1288 (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 1361). The respondent in this case is the State of Texas. The

respondent is not a federal officer, agent, or employee and is not subject to the statutory mandamus

authority of this court. This court lacks jurisdiction to entertain Norton's request for mandamus

relief.

III. Conclusion

Norton's petition for a writ of mandamus is DENIED. Any and all remaining pending

motions are DENIED as moot.

\_, 2017.

VANESSA D. GILMORE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE